

BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

RONALD F. HILDING, M.D.,

Holder of License No. **6043**For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine In the State of Arizona.

Board Case No. MD-08A-6043-MDX

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

(License Revocation)

On October 8th and 9th, 2008, this matter came before the Arizona Medical Board ("Board") for oral argument and consideration of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Brian Brendan Tully's proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Recommended Order. Ronald Hilding M.D., ("Respondent") was notified but did not appear before the Board, Special Counsel Marki Stewart represented the State. Chris Munns, Assistant Attorney General with the Solicitor General's Section of the attorney General's Office, was present and available to provide independent legal advice to the Board.

The Board, having considered the ALJ's decision and the entire record in this matter, hereby issues the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Arizona Medical Board ("Board") is the authority for licensing and regulating the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- 2. Ronald F. Hilding, M.D. ("Respondent") is the holder of License No. 6043 for the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- Respondent practiced psychiatry.
- 4. The Board issued a Complaint and Notice of Hearing in Docket No. 08A-6043-MDX alleging unprofessional conduct by Respondent. The Complaint and Notice of Hearing was mailed to Respondent at his address of record with the Board.
- 5. The Board referred the Complaint to the Office of Administrative Hearings, an independent agency, for an evidentiary hearing.

- 6. The commencement of the hearing was delayed 15 minutes to allow for the late arrival of Respondent or an attorney authorized to represent him. After the delay the Administrative Law Judge conducted the hearing in Respondent's absence.
- 7. On or about February 18, 2003, the Board, through its Executive Director, issued Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order for Decree of Censure against Respondent for unprofessional conduct in Case Nos. 00-0438, 98-0480, and 94-0584. The Board Ordered that Respondent be issued a Decree of Censure, that he reimburse the Board for its costs in bringing the case to formal hearing, that he participate, at his sole expense, in a Physician Assessment and Clinical Education Program ("PACE") within one year of the Order, that he successfully complete any recommendations resulting from the PACE evaluation, and periodic and random chart reviews at Respondent's sole expense.
- 8. On March 10, 2004, the Board considered Respondent's request for a modification of the prior Order requiring him to undergo the PACE evaluation. Respondent stated that it would be a financial hardship for him to undergo the evaluation.
- 9. At the March 10, 2004 Board meeting, the Board voted to deny Respondent's request to modify its prior Order.
- 10. On March 25, 2004, Respondent violated the Board's prior Order by not timely completing the PACE evaluation. Respondent had not paid the formal hearing costs of \$2,249.20.
- 11. Respondent did complete the two-day PACE Phase I assessment on May 23-24, 2005 at the University of California, San Diego.
- On the first day of Phase I testing, Respondent arrived one and a half hours late.
 On the second day he was thirty minutes late.
- 13. The assessment covered the following areas: Mock Patient History and Physical; Computer Delivered Tests PRIUM; Transaction Stimulated Recall (TSR) Interview; Cognitive Screening Test; Multiple Choice Exam- Ethics and Communication; Psychiatry Clinical Subject Exam; Mechanisms of Disease; Pharmacotherapeutics with Behavioral Health Examination; Oral Competency Exam-Psychiatry; Chart Review; and Exit Interview.

22

23

24

25

- 14. On or about March 9, 2006, a Summary Report PACE Phase I Assessment ("Summary Report") on Dr. Ronald Hilding was sent to Board staff. The Summary Report was authored by William A. Norcross, M.D., Professor of Clinical Family Medicine and Director of UCSD PACE Program, and Carole Sussman, Ph.D., Associate Director, C.O.O. UCSD PACE Program.
- 15. The Summary Report recommended that "a full neuropsychological evaluation was indicated before commencing with Phase II." A neuropsychological evaluation was scheduled for Respondent, but he failed to show up for the appointment.
- 16. The Summary Report opined that Respondent "lacks the knowledge and clinical judgment necessary to avoid potentially serious errors in patient management and subsequent care."
- 17. The Summary Report also concluded that "(t)he deficiencies documented during [Respondent's] two-day Phase-1 PACE Assessment, if applied in the real world of medical practice, may have resulted in patient harm."
- 18. The Board issued a Notice of Hearing in this matter advising Respondent of the time, date, and location of the formal hearing before the Office of Administrative Hearings. The Notice of Hearing was sent to Respondent at his address of record with the Board.
- 19. The commencement of the scheduled hearing was delayed 15 minutes to allow for the late arrival of Respondent or an attorney authorized to represent him. After the delay the Administrative Law Judge conducted the hearing in Respondent's absence.
- 20. Respondent failed to complete the full PACE evaluation as ordered by the Board.
- 21. Respondent is medically incompetent. He poses a danger to the public if permitted to continue practicing medicine.

Prior Board History

22. On December 20, 1983, the Board issued Respondent a Letter of Concern for his inappropriate prescribing and mismanagement of a patient.

		ı
	1	
	2	I
	3	I
	4	I
	5	I
	6	I
	7	
	8	
	9	
L	0	
L	1	
L	2	
L	3	
L	4	
L	5	
L	6	
L	7	
L	8	
L	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	

25

- 23. On July 23, 1991, the Board granted Respondent's Request for Inactive Status with Cause and Order Granting Inactive Status because of Respondent's substance abuse. Respondent's license was reactivated on October 15, 1993.
- On December 1, 1993, the Board and Respondent entered into a Stipulation and Order. Respondent was required to continue in therapy with quarterly reports to the Board and a chart survey for one year. This Consent Agreement was superseded by the Consent Agreement dated November 22, 1995.
- 25. On November 22, 1995, the Board and Respondent entered into another Stipulation and Order. Respondent was to take focused education in prescribing psychoactive substances and hire a practice management consultant. The Consent Agreement terminated on July 25, 1997.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Board has jurisdiction over Respondent and the subject matter in this case.
- Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.07(G) (2), the Board has the burden of proof in this
 matter. The standard of proof is preponderance of the evidence.
- 3. The conduct and circumstances described in the above Findings constitute unprofessional conduct by Respondent, pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401(27) (r).
- 4. The conduct and circumstances described in the above Findings demonstrate that Respondent is medically incompetent, Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 32-1451(A) and (J), and 32-1401(18).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, the Board revokes License No. 6043 for the practice of allopathic medicine previously issued to Ronald F. Hilding.

Respondent shall reimburse costs of the administrative hearing to the Board pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 32-1451(M) and 41-1007.

RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REHEARING OR REVIEW

Respondent is hereby notified that he has the right to petition for a rehearing or review. The petition for rehearing or review must be filed with the Board's Executive Director within thirty (30) days after service of this Order. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(B). The petition for rehearing or review must set forth legally sufficient reasons for granting a rehearing or review. A.A.C. R4-16-103. Service of this order is effective five (5) days after date of mailing. A.R.S. § 41-1092.09(C). If a petition for rehearing or review is not filed, the Board's Order becomes effective thirty-five (35) days after it is mailed to Respondent.

Respondent is further notified that the filing of a motion for rehearing or review is required to preserve any rights of appeal to the Superior Court.

DATED this _____ day of October, 2008.



THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

LISA WYNN

Executive Director

1	ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed this
2	day of October, 2008 with:
3	Arizona Medical Board 9545 East Doubletree Ranch Road Scottsdale, Arizona 85258
4	
5	Executed copy of the foregoing mailed by U.S. Mail this day of October, 2008, to:
6/	day of Colober, 2000, to.
7	Ronald F. Hilding, M.D. Address of Record
8	Respondent
9	Marki Stewart, Esq. Mariscal, Weeks, McIntyre & Friedlander, P.A.
10	Suite 200 2901 N. Central Ave.
11	Phoenix, AZ 85012
12	Special Counsel for the State of Arizona
13	
<u>ا 4</u>	Min Dany
	_ ,
15	
16	
17	
18	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
	4
23	